

01/05/05

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
014208.1498 (93-02-010)

TJL AF  
PATENT APPLICATION  
10/076,729



1

**In The United States Patent and Trademark Office  
On Appeal From The Examiner To The Board  
of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

In re Application of: Rod W. Lawing et al.  
Serial No.: 10/076,729  
Filing Date: February 15, 2002  
Examiner: Philip B. Tran  
Group Art Unit: 2155  
Title: *Method and System for Central Management of a Computer Network*

**MAIL STOP: APPEAL BRIEF**  
Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING  
BY EXPRESS MAIL**

I hereby certify that this communication is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: Mail Stop: Reply Brief, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Willie Jiles

Willie Jiles  
Date: January 3, 2005  
Exp. Mail Receipt No. EV 473952343 US

Dear Sir:

**Reply Brief**

Appellants respectfully submit this Reply Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 1.193(b)(1), in triplicate, in response to the Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed November 22, 2004.

Appellants filed an Appeal Brief on January 5, 2004, explaining clearly and in detail why the final rejection of Claims 1-43 is improper and why the Board should reverse the final rejection of Claims 1-43. Appellants also filed a Reply Brief on May 24, 2004, responding to the Examiner's Answer mailed March 24, 2004. Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the final rejection of Claims 1-43 and instruct the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance with respect to Claims 1-43.

**Argument**

The Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed November 22, 2004, merely corrects errors in the Examiner's Answer mailed March 24, 2004, that the Board noted in its Order mailed October 25, 2004. Appellants note that the Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed November 22, 2004, presents no new arguments supporting the rejection of independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 22, and 29.

In the Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed November 22, 2004, the Examiner again states, "The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal." (Examiner's Supplemental Answer, Page 3). Appellants again respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Appellants clearly stated in their Appeal Brief mailed January 5, 2004, "There are no known appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision regarding this Appeal." (Appellants' Appeal Brief, Page 2).

In the Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed November 22, 2004, the Examiner again states, "But, Appendix A shows patent application 09/548,466 is incorrect. It should be patent application 10/076,729." (Examiner's Supplemental Answer, Page 3). As Appellants pointed out in their Reply Brief mailed May 24, 2004, the heading on each of the sheets in Appendix A contains an incorrect Attorney Docket Number and an incorrect Patent Application Number. The correct Attorney Docket Number is 014208.1498 (93-02-010) and the correct Patent Application Number is 10/076,729.

Appellants again note that, in the Examiner's Answer mailed March 24, 2004, and in the Examiner's Supplemental Answer mailed November 22, 2004, the Examiner does not present any new arguments supporting the Examiner's rejection of independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 22, and 29. The Examiner simply maintains his assertion that *Davis* discloses "centralized management on heterogeneous client computer systems of different . . . operating system types . . . in order to install appropriate software" and that such centralized

management can be properly considered *managing configuration of an operating system of a network client*, as recited in independent Claim 1 and in substantially similar form in independent Claims 9, 17, 22, and 29. Appellants again respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Appellants have repeatedly pointed out that, even assuming for the sake of argument that *Davis* in fact discloses centralized management on heterogeneous client computer systems of different operating system types to install appropriate software," *Davis* fails to even suggest that such centralized management includes managing *configuration of an operating system*. Because the Examiner has repeatedly failed to demonstrate otherwise, the rejection of independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 22, and 29 as being unpatentable over *Davis* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper and should be reversed by the Board.

**Conclusion**

Appellants have demonstrated that the present invention, as claimed, is clearly distinguishable over the cited prior art. Therefore, Appellants respectfully request the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to reverse the final rejection of the Examiner and instruct the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance with respect to all pending claims.

Appellants believe no additional fees are due. Nonetheless, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Appellants



Travis W Thomas  
Reg. No. 48,667

January 3, 2005

Correspondence Address:

**Customer Number: 35005**